REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-65 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended, canceled, or added herein. Therefore, claims 1-65 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Olden

The final Office Action has rejected claims 1-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,460,141 to Eric M. Olden (hereinafter "Olden"). The Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1-65 submitted by the Applicants and Olden.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully argue that Olden fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, Olden fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, acquiring user identification information from a first authentication system by an authorization system that is separate from the first authentication system, relying on the first authentication system for authenticating a user, and performing, at the authorization system, authorization services for a request to access a resource.

As stated previously, Olden is directed to "[a] security and access management system [that] provides unified access management to address the specific problems facing the deployment of security for the Web and non-Web environment." Olden, Abstract. Also as stated previously, under the system of Olden, the authorization server performs both authentication and authorization services, while the entitlements server merely maintains the entitlements database, which holds data to be used by the authorization server. That is, the

authorization server of Olden performs both the authentication (determining whether the user is valid, *see* Olden, Fig. 29) and authorization (determining whether the user is authorized to access a particular URL, based on entitlements in the entitlements database, *see* Olden, Fig. 28). In other words, Olden is similar to the integrated solutions described in the background of the application. Application, p. 2, ll. 10-11. However, as an integrated system including both authentication and authorization functions, Olden does not, for example, provide the ability to use a legacy authentication system (i.e., a separate authentication system).

Independent claim 1 recites in part "acquiring user identification information from a first authentication system, said user identification information is associated with a request from a first user to access a first resource, said step of acquiring is performed by an authorization system, said authorization system is separate from said first authentication system; relying on said first authentication system for authenticating said first user" and "performing, at said authorization system, authorization services for said request to access said first resource based on said identity profile associated with said user identification information." The other independent claims, i.e., claims 15, 21, 26, 32, 38, 42, 46, 50, 55, 60 and 63, each recite similar limitations. That is, the independent claims recite an authorization system and an authentication system that are two separate systems, one of which (the authentication system) is responsible for verifying the identity of the user, and the other of which (the authorization system) is responsible for determining whether the user is authorized to access the requested resource.

The Office Action maintains that it interprets "the term 'separate' as not necessarily physical separation." However, mere "temporal separation" does not teach an authorization <u>system</u> that is separate from an authentication <u>system</u>. That is, the independent claims clearly define an authorization system and an authentication system that are distinct, separate <u>systems</u>. Olden does not teach or suggest such separate systems. Rather, Olden discloses only an integrated system including both authentication and authorization functions. Furthermore, even if the term "separate" might mean "temporal separation," "virtual separation," or "software module separation," nothing in Olden teaches or suggests any separation

whatsoever (however defined) between the authentication and authorization functions. Rather, Olden specifically teaches an integrated system similar to the systems described in the background of the present application that performs an integrated authentication/authorization process. For at least these reasons, claims 1-65 are believed to be distinct from Olden. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2006   /William J. Daley/
                                                         William J. Daley
                                                         Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
WJD/jln
60733925 v1